JH

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/996,899	11/30/2001	Howard Taub	10982142-1	3258

7590   10/04/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
VAN BRAMER, JOHN W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3622	

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/996,899	TAUB ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John Van Bramer	3622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _20 July 2006_.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-9,11-19,22-42 and 44-52_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-9,11-19,22-42 and 44-52_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   The amendment filed on July 20, 2006 cancelled no claims. Claims 1, 3, 4,

13-19, 22-30, 40, 49, and 50 were amended and Claims 51 and 52 were added.

Thus, the currently pending claims addressed in this action are 1-9, 11-19, 22-42,

and 44-52.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2.   The amendment filed on July 20, 2006 failed to correct the 35 U.S.C. 101

deficiencies identified in the Office Action dated April 20, 2006. Therefore, the 35

U.S.C. 101 rejection of Claims 13-19 is maintained. The term "module" in the

specification is specifically directed to a software program module (Specification:

Page 8, (Detailed Description: lines 1-17)). Therefore, the modification of the

preamble from an "email program" to a "system" has not corrected the previously

identified deficiency. A program per se, no clearly claimed as on a computer

readable medium, is recited.

3.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

4.   Claims 22-29, 49, 51 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the

claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The amendment to the

preamble has identified the claim to be directed towards an apparatus containing a

program. A computer program on a computer readable media is considered data on

a disk which is non-functional descriptive material (See MPEP 2106). In order to

meet the 35 U.S.C. 101 requirements the claimed invention must produce a "useful,

concrete, and tangible result", and the invention as currently claimed is not capable

of meeting these requirements. The apparatus claimed must contain a computer

processor that executes the claimed modules in order to produce a tangible result.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5.   The amendment filed on July 20, 2006 failed to correct the 35 U.S.C. 112,

second paragraph, deficiencies identified in the Office Action dated April 20, 2006.

Therefore the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection is maintained. The only change made by the

applicant was a modification of the preamble from a "printer" to a "system".

Therefore, the applicant has failed to define any structure relating to the claimed

"system" which would allow it to communicate over a network.

6.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7.   Claims 13-19, 51, and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second

paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission

amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted

elements are: The applicant has amended the preface to clarify that the claim is

directed towards an apparatus containing a program. However, the applicant has

failed to define any structure relating to the claimed "system" which would allow it to

communicate over a network as required by the operational steps set forth in the

claimed modules.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9.   Claims 1-9, 11, 12, and 30-39 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Goldhaber et al (5,794,210) in view of Dedrick (5,768,521).

Claim 1: Goldhaber discloses an apparatus for presenting content packages to a

user, comprising:

     a. A processor (Col 9, lines 33-40).

     b. A memory with a content package stored thereon (Col 10, lines 39-63 and

       Col 15, lines 26-28); and

     c. The content package including a message, a bank id, and a display value

       (Col 10, lines 39-63).

The Examiner notes Claim 1 is directed towards a server with three parts: a processor, a memory, and a content package (i.e. data) stored on the memory. Since no action is being taken on the stored data, no patentable weight is given as to what the data is or what type of data it is. However, notwithstanding that, Goldhaber does disclose a server with the same type of data stored thereon. Furthermore, Dedrick also discloses an apparatus for presenting content packages to a user that includes a processor and a memory with a content package stored thereon that includes a plurality of values arranged in a pricing hierarchy for advertising information for each advertising message based on how well the user's profile matches the target user's profile (Col 5, lines 47-50). Since Dedrick is presenting the content package to a user, the package has been displayed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a plurality of values with the content package stored in Goldhaber. One would have been motivated to have a plurality of values associated with the same content package in order to charge the advertiser based on the user's "worth" to the advertiser as in Dedrick.

Claim 2: Goldhaber and Dedrick disclose the apparatus of Claim 1 above, but Goldhaber does not explicitly disclose that the message has a message identifier (e.g. name, number, code, etc.). However, Dedrick discloses identifying the message in the content package with a unique identifier (Col 3, lines 39-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to also uniquely identify the message in <u>Goldhaber</u>.

One would have been motivated to include a message identifier in order to allow

<u>Goldhaber</u> to correlate the message with the correct content provider when

determining which content provider account to debit.

Claims 3 and 4: <u>Goldhaber</u> and <u>Dedrick</u> disclose the apparatus of Claim 1 above,

and <u>Goldhaber</u> further discloses paying the display value to the user upon the

message (advertisement) being displayed to or interacted upon by the user.

However, it is not explicitly disclosed that the user could receive additional payments

for both displaying <u>and</u> interacting with the message, such as printing or playing the

message. The Examiner notes that the disclosed interacting with the message by

the user would encompass all types of interactions to include viewing, clicking on,

printing, playing, listening to, or downloading and storing the message. These are

all well known types of interactions between a user and information being displayed

on the user's computer. It is also well known for an advertiser to pay a first amount

when a user is initially displayed an advertisement, and then pay a second amount if

the user interacts with the advertisement in one of the above mentioned ways. For

example, two well known methods for charging advertisers on the Internet are the

pay-per-view and the pay-per-click-through methods. Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

transfer a first value to the user in <u>Goldhaber</u> upon initially displaying the

advertisement and then a second value when the user interacts therewith, such as

printing or playing the advertisement. One would have been motivated to pay an additional value to the user in view of Goldhaber's goals of enticing the user to accept advertisements and of tracking the user's interactions therewith.

Claim 5: Goldhaber and Dedrick disclose the apparatus of Claim 1 above, and Goldhaber further discloses digitally signing the content package (Col 10, lines 9-38 and Col 16, lines 50-64).

Claim 6: Goldhaber and Dedrick disclose the apparatus of Claim 1 above, and Goldhaber further discloses instructions for receiving one of the values (Col 11, lines 45-58).

Claims 7-9: Goldhaber and Dedrick disclose the apparatus of Claim 1 above, and Goldhaber further discloses that at least one of the values is monetary, a credit on a purchase, or a credit slip (i.e. coupon)(Col 11, lines 8-44 and Col 18, lines 13-33).

Claims 11 and 12: Goldhaber and Dedrick disclose the apparatus of Claim 1 above, and Goldhaber further discloses receiving notice of receipt or recall (deletion) of the package (Col 5, line 54 – Col 6, line 2 and Col 17, lines 49-52).

Claim 30: Goldhaber discloses a method for presenting content packages to a user, comprising:

a. Constructing and delivering a content package consisting of a message and a rendering value (Col 9, lines 62-67);

b. Receiving notification of receipt of the content package (Col 5, line 54 – Col 6, line 2); and

c. Crediting the value to the receiver (user)(Col 16, lines 13-17).

While Goldhaber does not explicitly disclose that the rendering value is one of a plurality of rendering values associated with the content package, Dedrick also discloses a method for presenting (displaying) content packages to a user that includes constructing and storing a content package stored thereon that includes a plurality of values arranged in a pricing hierarchy for advertising information for each advertising message based on how well the user's profile matches the target user's profile (Col 5, lines 47-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a plurality of values with the content package stored in Goldhaber. One would have been motivated to have a plurality of values associated with the same content package in order to charge the advertiser based on the user's "worth" to the advertiser as in Dedrick.

Claim 31: Goldhaber and Dedrick disclose the method and apparatus of Claim 30 above, but Goldhaber does not explicitly disclose that the message has a message identifier (e.g. name, number, code, etc.). However, Dedrick discloses identifying the message in the content package with a unique identifier (Col 3, lines 39-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to also uniquely identify the message in Goldhaber. One would have been motivated to include a message identifier in order to allow Goldhaber to correlate the message with the correct content provider when determining which content provider account to debit.

Claims 32 and 33: Goldhaber and Dedrick disclose the method program as in Claim 30 above, and Goldhaber further discloses providing the bank id (and account number) of the receiver (user)(Col 16, line 13-17).

Claim 34: Goldhaber and Dedrick disclose the method as in Claim 30 above, and Goldhaber further discloses the message is displayed to or interacted upon by the user. However, it is not explicitly disclosed that the user interaction includes printing or playing the message. The Examiner notes that the disclosed interacting with the message by the user would encompass all types of interactions to include viewing, clicking on, printing, playing, listening to, or downloading and storing the message. These are all well known types of input/output interactions between a user and information being displayed on the user's computer (e.g. Dedrick, Col 1, lines 30-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the user to print or play the message. One would have been motivated to include printing or playing the message as part of Goldhaber's interactions in order to provide a more memorable experience for the

user; thus, increasing the likelihood that the user will remember the message

(advertisement) and, in case of message being in the form of a coupon as

Goldhaber discloses, providing a hard copy of the coupon for the customary in-store

redemption.

Claim 35: Goldhaber and Dedrick disclose the method as in Claim 30 above, and

Goldhaber further discloses the message is an advertisement (Col 9, lines 62-67

and Col 15, lines 25-27).

Claim 36: Goldhaber and Dedrick disclose the method as in Claim 30 above, and

Goldhaber further discloses verifying the bank account id and the funds therein (Col

7, lines 48-61).

Claim 37: Goldhaber and Dedrick disclose the method as in Claim 30 above, and

Goldhaber further discloses instructions for receiving the value (Col 11, lines 45-58).

Claim 38: Goldhaber and Dedrick disclose the method as in Claim 30 above, and

Goldhaber further discloses paying the display value to the user upon the message

(advertisement) being displayed to or interacted upon by the user. However, it is not

explicitly disclosed that the user could receive additional payments for both

displaying and interacting with the message, such as printing or playing the

message. The Examiner notes that the disclosed interacting with the message by

the user would encompass all types of interactions to include viewing, clicking on, printing, playing, listening to, or downloading and storing the message. These are all well known types of interactions between a user and information being displayed on the user's computer (e.g. Dedrick, Col 1, lines 30-32). It is also well known for an advertiser to pay a first amount when a user is initially displayed an advertisement, and then pay a second amount if the user interacts with the advertisement in one of the above mentioned ways. For example, two well known methods for charging advertisers on the Internet are the pay-per-view and the pay-per-click-through methods. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transfer a first value to the user in Goldhaber upon initially displaying the advertisement and then a second value when the user interacts therewith, such as printing or playing the advertisement. One would have been motivated to pay an additional value to the user in view of Goldhaber's goals of enticing the user to accept advertisements and of tracking the user's interactions therewith.

Claim 39: Goldhaber and Dedrick disclose the method of Claim 30 above, and Goldhaber further discloses digitally signing the content package (Col 10, lines 9-38 and Col 16, lines 50-64).

Claim 50: Goldhaber discloses a method for presenting content packages to a user, comprising:

    a. Constructing and delivering a content package consisting of a message and a rendering value (Col 9, lines 62-67)

    b. Verifying the bank account id and the funds therein (Col 7, lines 48-61)

    c. Receiving notification of receipt of the content package (Col 5, line 54 – Col 6, line 2); and

    d. Crediting the value to the receiver (user)(Col 16, lines 13-17).

While Goldhaber does not explicitly disclose that the rendering value is one of a plurality of rendering values associated with the content package, Dedrick also discloses a method for presenting content packages to a user that includes constructing and storing a content package stored thereon that includes a plurality of values arranged in a pricing hierarchy for advertising information for each advertising message based on how well the user's profile matches the target user's profile (Col 5, lines 47-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a plurality of values with the content package stored in Goldhaber. One would have been motivated to have a plurality of values associated with the same content package in order to charge the advertiser based on the user's "worth" to the advertiser as in Dedrick.

10.   Claims 13-29 and 40-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldhaber et al (5,794,210).

Claims 13, 22, 24, 40, 43, 45, 49, 51, and 52: <u>Goldhaber</u> discloses a method,

apparatus, system, and computer program for presenting content packages to a

user, comprising:

  a. Providing a computer processor (Col 9, lines 33-40);

  b. Storing a content package in memory (Col 10, lines 39-63 and Col 15,

   lines 26-28);

  c. The content package including a message, bank id, and display value (Col

   10, lines 39-63);

  d. Instructions for receiving the value (Col 11, lines 45-58);

  e. Verifying the bank account id and the funds therein (Col 7, lines 48-61);

  f. Receiving notice of receipt of the package (Col 5, line 54 – Col 6, line 2);

   and

  g. Crediting the value to the receiver (user)(Col 16, lines 13-17)

   While <u>Goldhaber</u> does not explicitly disclose that the user will preset a

desired value level for the display value and that the computer program will only

display messages with values which meet or exceed that level, it is disclosed that

the user presets a number of criteria for the selection of which messages will be

selected and displayed when the user is registering with the system. It is also

inherent that only a limited number of messages from which to select may be

displayed on the user's screen at one time. Therefore, it would have been obvious to

one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the

user to also set a minimum limit on the value of the message the user is willing to

accept. One would have been motivated to have the user in <u>Goldhaber</u> set such a minimum value level in order to increase the worth of <u>Goldhaber</u>'s invention to the user by eliminating low value messages, thus presenting only the highest valued messages on the user's screen to increase the user's satisfaction with the system.

Claims 14, 18, and 42: <u>Goldhaber</u> discloses the method, system and computer program of Claims 13 and 40 above, and further discloses paying the display value to the user upon the message (advertisement) being displayed to or interacted upon by the user. However, it is not explicitly disclosed that the user could receive additional payments for both displaying <u>and</u> interacting with the message, such as printing or playing the message. The Examiner notes that the disclosed interacting with the message by the user would encompass all types of interactions to include viewing, clicking on, printing, playing, listening to, or downloading and storing the message. These are all well known types of interactions between a user and information being displayed on the user's computer. It is also well known for an advertiser to pay a first amount when a user is initially displayed an advertisement, and then pay a second amount if the user interacts with the advertisement in one of the above mentioned ways. For example, two well known methods for charging advertisers on the Internet are the pay-per-view and the pay-per-click-through methods. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transfer a first value to the user in <u>Goldhaber</u> upon initially displaying the advertisement and then a second value when

the user interacts therewith, such as printing or playing the advertisement. One

would have been motivated to pay an additional value to the user in view of

Goldhaber's goals of enticing the user to accept advertisements and of tracking the

user's interactions therewith.

Claims 15, 25, 26, 47, and 48: Goldhaber discloses the apparatus, method, system,

and computer program as in Claims 13, 22, and 40 above, and further discloses

sending a notification upon completion of the funds transfer (Col 17, lines 44-63).

Claims 16, 17 and 46: Goldhaber discloses the method, system and computer

program as in Claims 13 and 40 above, and further discloses the message is

displayed to or interacted upon by the user. However, it is not explicitly disclosed

that the user interaction includes printing or playing the message. The Examiner

notes that the disclosed interacting with the message by the user would encompass

all types of interactions to include viewing, clicking on, printing, playing, listening to,

or downloading and storing the message. These are all well known types of

input/output interactions between a user and information being displayed on the

user's computer (e.g. Dedrick, Col 1, lines 30-32). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

allow the user to print or play the message. One would have been motivated to

include printing or playing the message as part of Goldhaber's interactions in order

to provide a more memorable experience for the user; thus, increasing the likelihood

that the user will remember the message (advertisement) and, in case of message

being in the form of a coupon as <u>Goldhaber</u> discloses, providing a hard copy of the

coupon for the customary in-store redemption.

Claim 19: <u>Goldhaber</u> discloses the system as in Claim 13 above, and further

discloses providing the bank id (and account number) of the receiver (user)(Col 16,

line 13-17).

Claims 20 and 21: <u>Goldhaber</u> discloses the system as in Claim 13 above, and

further discloses the computer program running on various user devices to include a

personal computer. While it is not explicitly disclosed that the computer program is

running on a printer, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made that the user device could include a printer, if

the printer had the required computing capability, or if a computer has a built-in

printing capability, such as the Wang™ word processors of the 1980's. The

Examiner notes that the line between a computer with printing capabilities and a

printer with computing capabilities is very fine and is quickly becoming non-existent

with the emergence of multiple-use devices. Thus, <u>Goldhaber</u>'s disclosure of

various types of user devices would also encompass a printer with the necessary

processing and memory capabilities or a computer with the necessary printing

capabilities.

Claim 23: Goldhaber discloses the system as in Claim 22 above, and further

discloses deleting the message if the value is too low (Col 18, lines 49-50 and Col

19, lines 4-18). Goldhaber discloses the system deactivating the advertisement

once the user has accessed (and received payment for) it and also the user deleting

the message when it is no longer desired. Therefore, it would have been obvious to

one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the system

to delete messages that did not meet the user's criteria from the list of messages

selected for delivery to the user. One would have been motivated to delete the

messages that did not meet the user's minimum value level, in order to present only

those messages that meet all of the user's selection criteria.

Claims 27-29: Goldhaber discloses the system as in Claim 22 above, and further

discloses that the value is monetary, a credit on a purchase, or a credit clip (i.e.

coupon)(Col 11, lines 8-44 and Col 18, lines 13-33).

Claim 41: Goldhaber discloses the method as in Claim 40 above, and further

discloses the message is an advertisement (Col 9, lines 62-67 and Col 15, lines 25-

27).

Claim 44: Goldhaber discloses the method of Claim 40 above, and further discloses

digitally signing the content package (Col 10, lines 9-38 and Col 16, lines 50-64).

Response to Arguments

11.   Applicant's arguments filed on July 20, 2006 have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive.

  a. The applicant argues that neither Goldhaber et al. nor Dedrick teach a

   server distributing content to a receiver including a plurality of values that

   indicated different amounts based on a manner of rendering that the

   sender offers to credit a receiver as indicated in Claims 1 and 30.

   However, both Goldhaber and Dedrick disclose broad based advertising

   and targeted advertising and Dedrick specifically states that the target

   user profile may be associated with a pricing hierarchy for advertising

   information, such that a targeted end user receives a larger price credit

   than an end user that was not targeted (Col 5, lines 47-50. Additionally,

   Dedrick discloses multiple payment structures based upon rendering such

   as per view, per byte, and per time (Col 5, lines 11-25. Furthermore,

   Goldhaber also discloses nested pricing based upon user interaction (Col

   7, lines 62-67).

  b. The applicant argues that neither Goldhaber et al. nor Dedrick disclose a

   rendering module configured to render content message if the value that

   the sender is willing to pay the receiver to render the content message

   meets or exceeds a payment value established in the rule module and if

   the bank request module verifies the funds are in the advertisers account

   as indicated in Claims 13, 40, 49 and 50. However, Goldhaber specifically

discloses users selecting a thumbnail image based upon a presented

payment value. Selection of said thumbnail image results in an account-

to-account transaction, which inherently includes verification of funds from

the advertiser (Col 10, lines 39-66).

c. The applicant argues that neither Goldhaber et al. nor Dedrick disclose a

system including a rules module that contains a value the receiver

requires from the sender for the receiver to print (display on a screen) the

content message and prints (displays) the content message if the value

offered is greater than or equal to the value required by the receiver as

indicated in Claim 22. However, Goldhaber specifically states that the

receiver makes the selection based upon price and interest (Col 10, lines

39-66). Therefore, the rules module in Goldhaber is the module that

accepts display and do not display instructions from the receiver and then

carries out these rules.

Conclusion

12.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented

in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire

THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is

filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory

action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory

period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action

is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from

the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory

period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

13.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to John Van Bramer whose telephone number is

(571) 272-8198. The examiner can normally be reached on 6am - 4pm Monday

through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on (571) 272-6724. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned

is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR

only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the

Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like

assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the

automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-

272-1000.

jvb

ERIC W. STAMBER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600